1	Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)		
2	jsaveri@lchb.com Michele C. Jackson (State Bar No. 090807)		
3	<i>mjackson@lchb.com</i> Eric B. Fastiff (State Bar No. 182260)		
4	efastiff@lchb.com Andrew S. Kingsdale (State Bar No. 255669)		
5	akingsdale@lchb.com Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein, LLP		
6	275 Battery Street, Suite 3000 San Francisco, CA 94111-3339		
7	Tel: (415) 956-1000 Fax: (415) 956-1008		
8	Attorneys for Individual and Representative Plaintiff		
9	Margarita Lacabe		
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
12	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
13			
14	ANDREA RESNICK, GARY BUNKER, JOHN HALEY, AMY LATHAM, ERIC	Case No. C 09-0002 PJH	
15	ROSLANSKY and KEVIN SIMPSON, on behalf of themselves and all others	DECLARATION OF MICHELE C. JACKSON IN SUPPORT OF ADMINISTRATIVE	
16	similarly situated,	MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER CASE NO. C 09-0402 JL SHOULD BE	
17	Plaintiffs,	RELATED PURSUANT TO CIVIL L. R. 3-12	
18	V.		
19	WALMART.COM USA LLC, WAL- MART STORES, INC., and NETFLIX,		
20	INC.,		
21	Defendants.		
22			
23	I, Michele C. Jackson, declare as follows:		
24	1. I am a member in good standing of the Bar of the State of California and a		
25	partner in the law firm Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein, LLP, counsel of record for Plaintiff		
26	in Lacabe v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al., Case No. 09-CV-0402 JL. I submit this declaration		
27	in support of the Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Case No. C 09-0402 JL Should Be		
28			
		DECLARATION OF JACKSON ISO ADMINISTRATIVE	

5

11

12 13

14

15

16 17 18

19 20

22

21

23 24

25

26

27 28 Related Pursuant to Civil L. R. 3-12. I make this declaration based on my personal knowledge, and if called to testify to the contents, I could and would competently do so.

- 2. Attached as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of the class action complaint filed on January 2, 2009, in Resnick v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al., Case No. 09-CV-0002, and assigned to the Honorable Phyllis J. Hamilton...
- 3. Attached as Exhibit B is a true and correct copy of the class action complaint filed on January 28, 2009, in Lacabe v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al., Case No. 09-CV-0402 JL.
- 4. The plaintiffs in the *Lacabe* and the *Resnick* actions allege that the same Defendants violated federal antitrust law by illegally allocating and monopolizing markets for DVD sales and rentals. Plaintiffs in the *Lacabe* and *Resnick* actions all raise claims for violations of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1 and 2. Plaintiffs in other cases make similar claims in the other cases that have previously been related to Resnick, according to the Docket in Case No. 09-CV-0002, which are:

Related Cases	Filed
3:09-cv-0096-PJH O'Connor v. Walmart.com USA LLC et al.	01/15/2009
3:09-cv-0111-PJH Endzweig v. Walmart.com USA LLC et al.	01/20/2009
3:09-cv-0116-PJH Schmitz v. Walmart.com USA LLC et al.	01/20/2009
3:09-cv-0138-PJH Lynch et al. v. Walmart.com USA LLC et al.	01/20/2009
3:09-cv-0139-PJH Groce et al. v. Netflix, Inc. et al.	01/20/2009
3:09-cv-0156-PJH Sivek v. Walmart.com USA LLC et al.	01/27/2009
3:09-cv-0180-PJH Faris v. Netflix, Inc. et al.	01/27/2009
3:09-cv-0225-PJH Slobodin v. Netflix, Inc. et al.	01/29/2009
3:09-cv-0236-PJH Anthony et al. v. Walmart.com USA LLC et al.	01/27/2009
3:09-cv-0244-PJH Polk-Stamps v. Netflix, Inc. et al.	01/29/2009
3:09-cv-0274-PJH Sheeler v. Walmart.com USA LLC et al.	02/03/2009
3:09-cv-0294-PJH Chapman v. Netflix, Inc. et al.	01/29/2009
3:09-cv-0297-PJH Orozco v. Netflix, Inc. et al.	01/29/2009
3:09-cv-0340-PJH Landels et al. v. Netflix, Inc. et al.	02/03/2009
3:09-cv-0349-PJH Grime v. Netflix, Inc. et al.	02/03/2009
3:09-cv-0361-PJH Meyer v. Walmart.com USA LLC et al.	02/03/2009
3:09-cv-0368-PJH Randall v. Walmart.com USA LLC et al.	02/03/2009
3:09-cv-0375-PJH Hirsch v. Netflix, Inc. et al.	02/03/2009
3:09-cv-0377-PJH Miscioscia v. Netflix, Inc. et al.	02/03/2009
3:09-cv-0391-PJH Chatelain v. Netflix, Inc. et al.	02/03/2009

5. A stipulation pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-11(a) could not be obtained because Defendants that have been sued in *Lacabe* have yet to appear in the action. Local Rule 3-

1	12 requires an administrative motion to consider whether cases should be related to be filed
2	promptly.
3	I declare under penalty of perjury, pursuant to the laws of the United States, that
4	the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 4th day of February, 2009, in San Francisco,
5	California
6	s/ Michele C. Jackson
7	Michele C. Jackson
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

28